

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 are all the claims pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 2-4, 7-10 and 12-34 have been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species. Thus, claims 1, 5, 6 and 11 have been examined in the subject application. By way of this amendment, applicants have amended claims 1 and 11.

More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to address the section § 112 claim (second paragraph) rejection and claim 11 has been amended to include the limitation of allowable claim 5. Since claim 11 has been amended to include the limitation of allowable claim 5, it is submitted that claim 11 is allowable.

For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the §102 prior art rejection of independent claim 1 based on Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 4,918,578).

Claim 1 recites that the light reflecting face reflects light from the light source toward the display light guide. In addition, amended claim 1 clarifies that the light collection portion and the light reflecting face thereof are positioned between the light source and the display light guide.

Thompson discloses a visual display device illuminated by an edge lighting means. In the rejection, the Examiner refers to many of the figures in Thompson to support the rejection. Frankly, the Examiner's rationale for the rejection is not entirely clear. However, based on Applicants' understanding, the Examiner contends that reference numeral 84 (the transparent panel) in Figure 10 corresponds to the light guide, reference numeral 80 corresponds to the light

source and reference numeral 82 (the light refracting conduit) corresponds to the light collection portion having a parabolic light reflective surface (u-shaped channel 16, 89).

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Thompson fails to teach or suggest a display which includes a light collection portion having a light reflecting face in which both the light collection portion and the light reflecting face are positioned between the light source and the display light guide. More specifically, according to claim 1, the light reflection face has a parabolic face and is positioned between the light source and the display light guide. In Thompson, the Examiner contends that the interior surface of the channel 16, 89 (disposed at the bottom portion) corresponds to the light reflecting face. However, this surface is disposed on the opposite side of the light source from the transparent panel 84, which the Examiner analogizes to the claimed display light guide.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants' submit that Thompson does not anticipate independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Thus, the Examiner is requested to allow claim 1 and all of its dependent claims 2-10.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-11 are in condition for allowance. Applicants reserve the right to further prosecute withdrawn claims 12-34.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 10/718,606

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: Q78589

Respectfully submitted,



Brian W. Hannon  
Registration No. 32,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 19, 2006